

From: HndHvrWolf@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/24/02 2:32am
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

To whom it may concern:

My name is Aaron Henderson. I am deeply concerned about the upcoming settlement of the Microsoft anti-trust case. I have so much to say about this case that I could not fit it all into a single letter. But there are at least three arguments to be made against the government's case, the practicality of anti-trust and the morality of punishing the able. First, the government claims that Microsoft was engaging in anti-competitive business practices. Exactly what concept of "competition" do the government and the anti-trust laws hold? As far as I know, when there is a competition, there are winners and there are losers. When Microsoft began bundling Internet Explorer, Netscape had the vast majority of the market. Microsoft turned the situation around without resorting to government intervention. Microsoft was winning, honestly; consequently their competitors (who were losing because they were unable to compete) are now asking the government to stop Microsoft lest they actually win. This is the equivalent of a golf player, unable to compete with Tiger Woods, who asks someone to break Woods's legs, lest Woods win. Remember, it was the competitors who brought the suit, not the consumers whom they claim to want to protect. Curious, is it not, how their selfless protection of us conveniently removes their greatest competitor?

But what if they win? cry our would-be protectors. Well, that means we consumers have received what we wanted. We have voted, with our dollars, to support Microsoft, not their competitors. If the goal of the government is to protect the consumers, should they not be on Microsoft's side? After all, they are the ones who have responded best to the consumer. The less competent losers (henceforward "the losers") in this competition should not be foisted on an unwilling public because they are less competent. What kind of a world would that be? A world where competition is ruled by the less able is a world where people would compete to see who could do the shoddiest job, where the winner of such a contest is the biggest, laziest slacker, whose reward is money extorted at the point of a gun from those who committed the unspeakable crime of being good at what they do. How dare they! How is a law that creates this situation practical?

This leads me to my last, most important point. How is a law that creates the above situation moral? If morality is the sanction of life and a measure of someone's fitness to exist, what sort of life is the one described above? What sort of person would desire to live by the effort they did not exert? If no one else will say it, I will. It is only the unfit, the unsanctified, in short, the immoral who choose to live on what they have not chosen to do. The losers are now asking to be compensated for their lack of ability. It is immoral. To reward failure is immoral and impractical; it violates the rights of consumers and the able, honest producers. Do not, I

beg all who have power in this case, do not punish Microsoft. Ability is neither a vice nor a burden.

Sincerely,

Aaron Henderson.

Email:Hoverwolf1@go.com